DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 369 205 EC 302 934

AUTHOR	Moon, M. Sherril; And Others
TITLE	Integrating Summer Day Camps: A Process for City-Wide Change. Project REC.
INSTITUTION	Children's Hospital, Boston, MA. Training and Research Inst. for People with Disabilities.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	[91]
CONTRACT	H086U00030
NOTE	23p.; For a related document, see EC 302 930.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Agency Cooperation; *Camping; Change Strategies; Community Programs; Day Programs; Normalization (Disabilities); *Program Development; Recreational Activities; *Severe Disabilities; *Social Integration; *Summer Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Massachusetts (Waltham)

ABSTRACT

Developed as part of a study which attempted to integrate students with severe disabilities into regular recreational and leisure activities, this report focuses on integrating summer camps in the Greater Waltham (Massachusetts) area. It documents how a segregated camp for children and teens with disabilities can be closed down and the campers integrated into existing summer programs. It also describes how an age-appropriate program can be implemented for a large number of people simultaneously, how families and agencies can work together to plan a new program, and how such an integrated summer program can be cost effective. The process of developing the integration plan is detailed for both the first and second years of change. For each year, the report includes planning procedures by the Greater Waltham Association for Retarded Citizens and community groups, coordinating among the city camps, meeting with parents, developing staffing plans, training counselors, and planning transportation. A chart offers budget comparisons over 3 years. The process of change was accomplished in 2 years and has been accepted by all groups as successful. Tables provide such information as "Tips for Enhancing Integration" and "Daily Guide for Sending Children to Camp." (Contains 16 references.) (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 369 205

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Integrating Summer Day Camps: A Process for City-Wide Change

Training and Research Institute for People with Disabilities

Children's Hospital, Boston

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Integrating Summer Day Camps: A Process for City-Wide Change

M. Sherril Moon

Department of Special Education

University of Maryland

Paula Rogerson

Greater Waltham Association for Retarded Citizens

Waltham, Massachusetts

Cheska Komissar

Project REC, Children's Hospital

Boston, Massachusetts

Running Head: Integrating Summer Camps

The development and dissemination of this work was supported through a grant from the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services of the United States Department of Education (#H086U00030) to the Training and Research Institute for People with Disabilities at Children's Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts.

©Project REC, Training and Research Institute for People with Disabilities: this article may be copied for private use but not for profit or publication.

Integrating Summer Camps: A Process for City-Wide Change

The literature abounds with reports on the importance of providing integrated, age-appropriate leisure or recreation activities to children and adolescents with severe disabilities (Brown, Branston-McLean, Baumgart, Vincent, Falvey & Schroeder, 1979; Datillo, 1991; Moon & Bunker, 1987: Nietupski, Hamre-Nietupski, & Ayers, 1984; York, Vandercook & Stave, 1990). The reasons for providing integrated leisure programs in schools and communities include increases in the ability of the young persons with severe disabilities to initiate normal behavior, use appropriate language, and engage in social responses (Brinker, 1985; Donder & Nietupski, 1981: Stainback & Stainback, 1985). Participants who are not disabled enjoy the opportunity to teach and learn from persons who are differently abled and tend to have a more positive attitude toward persons with disabilities after participation (Halle, Gabler-Halle, & Bemken, 1989: McHale & Simeonsson, 1980; Voeltz, 1982).

Regardless of the philosophical reports espousing the necessity of integrated leisure programs, there are still relatively few data based reports indicating how to successfully establish and maintain such programs in typical schools and community sites (Schleien & Ray, 1988). Most research on leisure participation has focused solely on individual skills development and has occurred in isolated situations such as a segregated classroom or gymnasium (Nietupski & Nietupski, 1986). A survey of persons with disabilities in one east coast state showed that their desire for "normal" leisure and social opportunities in their home neighborhoods was one of the greatest need of citizens with disabilities in that state (Isaacs & Clark, 1988).

One of the most typically occurring community recreation activities for children and adolescents in this country is attending summer camp, either in the form of local day camps or sleep-over camps (Mitchell, Robberson, & Obley, 1977). The summer day camp phenomenon has grown very popular in the last two decades as more and more families seek a substitute for schools to care for children while both parents work out of the home during the day. Children and adults with disabilities in many communities have also benefitted from segregated camp and camping experiences (Rynders, Schleien, & Mustonen, 1990). The literature is virtually void of reports indicating how a town or any group can integrate its summer camp programs (Edwards & Smith, 1989).

©Project REC, Training and Research Institute for People with Disabilities: this article may be copied for private use but not for profit or publication.

The purpose of this report is to document how a typically urban community can close down a segregated camp for children and teens with disabilities and integrate the campers into existing summer programs. This information can be helpful to families, consumers, and program providers for several reasons. First, it indicates how one of the most age-appropriate programs can be implemented for a large number of people simultaneously in a short period of time. Second, it indicates how families and agencies can work together to plan a new program. Third, it documents the cost effectiveness of an integrated summer program.

Developing the Integration Plan

During the 1980's the Greater Waltham (Massachusetts) Association for Retarded Citizens (GWARC) along with the city school system and parks and recreation department had developed a special summer camp, Camp Discovery, for children and adolescents with disabilities. This "special" camp, heavily supported by the GWARC board of directors, parents, and the city was an important part of the agency's operations, serving approximately 30 to 50 campers during the summer months. In early 1990 several of the GWARC members (primarily parents of elementary aged children with disabilities) and the recreation director decided that the youth from Waltham with disabilities should be able to attend regular day camps in the city. This group anticipated that some families (primarily those parents of older adolescents with disabilities) and GWARC staff would object to a sudden and complete "shut down" of Camp Discovery. Therefore, the goal for the first half of 1990 became determining how to provide the kinds of camp experiences that all families desired for the upcoming summer. Full integration across camps and disbanding of Camp Discovery was the plan for the second year.

The Plan for the First Year

The GWARC director, recreation director, and leisure/recreation consultant funded through a federal grant to Boston Children's Hospital met several times and decided to try to offer families a choice of camp options during this first summer of change. These options included enrolling as regular campers in one of four city camps in which GWARC camp counselors and other GWARC

©Project REC, Training and Research Institute for People with Disabilities: this article may be copied for private use but not for profit or publication.

staff would provide extra support to the regular camp's staff. Parents could also enroll their child in the "camp within a camp" at the YMCA. At this site GWARC counselors would accompany campers to and from the YMCA each day and provide some separate activities for the campers with disabilities. GWARC had its own meeting space at the camp, provided some equipment, and applied for a separate operating license with the city. The intent for this camp was to integrate campers into as many of the YMCA camp activities as possible. This was relatively easy to implement by scheduling activities to occur simultaneously with those of the Y camp.

The city camps. The GWARC recreation director approached all city camp directors during the months of January and February to discuss integrating campers and GWARC staff into their programs. Although a couple of directors were hesitant at first, they were ultimately convinced that having a ratio of one new (GWARC) counselor to two-four new campers (children with disabilities) was a good idea. They were also assured that the recreation director, consultant from Children's Hospital, a behavioral consultant, and the GWARC nurse would be on call to assist during any crisis. The other fear expressed was that fees would have to increase or enrollment would need to drop to accommodate campers with disabilities. This was not the case since GWARC was providing extra staff who would be working with all campers and since campers with disabilities would be paying fees equivalent to other campers. Actually, enrollment as well as supervision would only increase.

The GWARC recreation director stressed the importance of the city camps serving all families and the benefit of sharing resources. She was quick to point out that families would be very disappointed if the camps were not open to including their children and that they would do everything possible to make this a successful effort. All camp directors were willing to try the new approach and expressed that their camp should be open to all citizens of the city. A description of the camps is provided in Table 1.

Meeting with parents. The GWARC executive director, recreation director, and consultant held a special meeting for families during late March immediately after all city camps agreed to the plan. The various options and staffing plans were described and families were given the opportunity to sign their kids up for any of the camps for two-week periods. They could even choose several

©Project REC, Training and Research Institute for People with Disabilities: this article may be copied for private use but not for profit or publication.

Table 1
Description of City Camps

Type of Camp / Descriptors	Boys/Girls Club	Girl Scout	City Camp	YMCA
Age of Campers	4 to 13 years	6 to 14 years (15-16, Counselor in Training)	4 to 13 years	3 to 12 years (13-15, Counselor in Training)
Age of Counselors	16 to 25 years +	17 to 40 years +	17 to 21 years	16 to 22 years (second year: 18 to 25+)
Duration	one week to full summer	two week sessions (waiting list for more than one session	one to two weeks (waiting list for additional weeks	one week to full summer
Cost to Attend	ages 4-6: $11/day ages 7-12: $50/week $5 discount per each additional child	$200/two weeks	$45/week	$80/week $16/week for transportation
Environment	nature reservation housing ca. 10 other camps of comparable size, several roofed structures, large lake, children grouped by age in mixed gender groups	large wooded estate (67 acres), several buildings as well as roofed structures, international counselors, outdoor pool, girls grouped by age	city owned, municipal recreation area, outdoor temporary pool, hiking trails, one building, children grouped by age and gender	located at YMCA, indoor/ outdoor pools, large field, gym and daycare center, Inner-city Hispanic camp plus a preschool camp add ca. 110 children to the site), children grouped by age and gender
Typical Schedule	8-9 meet at Boys Club/ load buses 9:30-10 arrival at camp 10-10:30 group meeting 10:30-4 boating, swimming, crafts, games, occasional team sports, hiking 4:30 return to Boys Club	8:30 arrival 8:30-9:30 opening ceremonies 9-3 swimming, crafts, adventure course, educational lectures, games, singing, long walks between activities 3-3:30 closing cermony/ departure	9 arrival 9-9:15 open play 9:15-3 in increments of 45 minutes: swimming, sports/games, hikes,m crafts, singing, talent shows, contests 3-3:15 departure	9-9:30 singing 9:30-4 outdoors: archery, sports and games, swimming, crafts; indoors: drama, gym, first aid. First year: lots of time where children had free play. For a more detailed description of the second year schedule see Table 6.

©Project REC, Training and Research Institute for People with Disabilities; this article may be copied for private use but not for profit or publication

different camps over the six week period. For example, a family could choose the YMCA "camp within a camp" for the first two weeks, girl scouts for the second two, and either camp within a camp or Boy's or Girl's Club for the final two weeks. The only real deterrent to participation was the cost of the camps which ranged from $90 to $200 for a two week period. GWARC did offer scholarships to some families who could not afford all costs. Families were asked to make decisions by the first week in May so that final plans for integrating the camps could be made over a six week period.

Staffing Plans. The staffing patterns, transportation plans, and final budget depended heavily on where families decided to enroll their sons or daughters during each two week period. The original plan was to hire the same number of counselors (seven) as in previous years but to assign them to various camps as needed. Of course, the training program would be altered so that counselors would learn to work with all campers and would be able to facilitate integration. As it turned out, the original hiring pattern was sufficient. Table 2 indicates where campers were enrolled and how counselors were assigned over the entire summer.

Table 2
Camper Enrollment/Counselor Assignment

Type of Camp / Weeks	Boys/Girls Club	Girl Scout	City Camp	YMCA
1-2	# of campers: 1.00 # of counselors: 1.00	# of campers: 1.00 # of counselors: 0.50	# of campers: 0.00 # of counselors: 0.00	# of campers: 18.00 # of counselors: 4.50
3-4	# of campers: 5.00 # of counselors: 1.00	# of campers: 2.00 # of counselors: 0.75	# of campers: 0.00 # of counselors: 0.00	# of campers: 18.00 # of counselors: 4.25
5-6	# of campers: 3.00 # of counselors: 1.00	# of campers: 2.00 # of counselors: 0.50	# of campers: 1.00 # of counselors: 0.50	# of campers: 18.00 # of counselors: 5.00

*Please note that a decimal denotes a counselor splitting his/her time between camps as needed.

One of the factors that facilitated the integration into various camps was the availability of the GWARC recreation director, the consultant, the nurse, and the behavioral consultant to go to any camp when necessary. The recreation director kept a beeper and could have been at any of the camps

©Project REC, Training and Research Institute for People with Disabilities: this article may be copied for private use but not for profit or publication.

within a half-hour. Incidentally, she was never beeped! The consultant, particularly during the first two weeks visited all camps so that she could meet with counselors, directors, or parents and alleviate any anxieties about "the new kids" at camp. The consultant and behavioral consultant only worked about 10 hours each week and the nurse was utilized during weeks when children with physical or medical disabilities were attending camps.

Training counselors. Camp counselors hired by GWARC had always received two and one-half days of training prior to the beginning of camp each summer. The length of this training period was not changed but the content was altered to accommodate the new functions of the counselors. Most importantly, they were provided training in how to get the kids with and without disabilities to participate together in activities and how to interact with the kids without disabilities. They were also provided new training in positive behavior management techniques and communication alternatives. All counselors visited the new camps to which they were assigned to meet their peer counselors and to become familiar with the schedules.

During one session, counselors from the YMCA camp and those counselors for the YMCA "camp within a camp" were jointly trained on integration strategies by the GWARC recreation director and the integration consultant. Retrospectively, more of this kind of joint training would have been helpful, and in future years the plan became to train all counselors together. This is important for several reasons. First, counselors who have not worked with kids with disabilities need to know how to interact with these campers in "normal" ways. They also need training in facilitating interactions between campers. Second, counselors who have only worked with campers with disabilities are not used to the unstructured nature and high level of activity in regular camps. Third, most counselors are outgoing, older teenagers in high school or college who have only viewed people with disabilities as "special" or "different." Any type of integration training they receive is likely to be a first and, therefore, very powerful. We may be in the unique position of changing the attitudes of many young people, in this case over 100 in one summer in one city.

Transportation. In previous years, a van or bus provided by GWARC had carried campers from their homes to Camp Discovery. This mode was continued for the YMCA "camp within a

©Project REC, Training and Research Institute for People with Disabilities: this article may be copied for private use but not for profit or publication

camp." For the other camps, which did provide bus transportation from central sites around the city, counselors and campers met the buses at designated sites. Parents were responsible for getting campers to these sites or they could drive their sons or daughters directly to the camps. Bus drivers and all counselors were given directions on what to do in certain situations regarding campers with disabilities (e.g., parents are late to meet camper or camper refuses to get on or off the bus).

The Plan for the Second Year

Beginning in January after the first successful summer of integrated camps, the GWARC recreation director began meeting with the leisure/recreation consultant from Boston Children's Hospital in order to discuss what options might be most appropriate for the second summer. Although the first year of integrating the summer camps was met with some hesitancy by a few parents who were concerned about losing services, the success of the first summer, defined by the enthusiasm and success of the children, put the parents' fears to rest. It was therefore decided that in order to enhance full integration of all children in summer camp, no "camp within a camp" option needed to operate the second year. In other words, all children would be enrolled in the four city camps from the beginning. GWARC would continue to hire counselors to provide extra support to the regular camps' staff, but a separate operating license would not be necessary. The licensing issue is an important point to consider in integrating camps because in many states, such as Massachusetts, camps with children with disabilities must have registered nurses. This was avoided by having GWARC write the state board of health to assure them that a registered nurse from GWARC would be on call at all times during camp hours.

Meeting with the Camps. During the months of February and March the GWARC recreation director met with all of the camp directors. Although the responses of the directors varied, all were excited to continue what had begun the previous year. One director felt that he would need no assistance if a child with a disability came to his camp. He stated that he had learned enough the previous year to include any child in his camp, but was thankful that he could call on GWARC for assistance if the need arose. Two of the camp directors asked the recreation director to assist them in their counselor training and provide support to campers only if a problem arose. Both of these

©Project REC, Training and Research Institute for People with Disabilities: this article may be copied for private use but not for profit or publication.

directors assured GWARC that they would accept any child who applied to their camps regardless of the type or severity of their disability as long as camp directors could call on GWARC for assistance at any time.

Finally, since most of the parents expressed an interest in the YMCA camp the second year, GWARC concentrated their efforts there. The recreation director had numerous meetings with the new director of the camp from early March through the beginning of camp in June in order to address all his concerns. Once again, the main concern was that he may have to decrease his enrollment numbers in order to accommodate campers with special needs. However, after several meetings he understood that the campers would be registering directly with his camp and could only increase his enrollments. Throughout these preparatory meetings both directors agreed that the staff from the YMCA and the support staff provided by GWARC should all be treated as one staff in order to build a more cohesive group, hence enhancing all the campers' experiences.

Meeting with the parents. In March, the GWARC recreation director sent letters to all parents who had children with disabilities involved in GWARC programs. In the letter, the different camps were described, along with the stated assurance that GWARC would once again be available for providing support to those campers who needed it. The parents were asked to fill out a form stating which camps(s) they would like their child to attend and during what time. It was explained that this was not a final registration and that in order to register, the parent would need to contact the camp directly and request an application. This preliminary form provided a means of discerning the type of support GWARC would need to provide. The cost was still a deterrent to some parents, but GWARC was able to provide some assistance as well as help parents apply for scholarships directly form the camps they would be attending. Families were told that each camp had its own deadline for applications and it was up to the parents to meet these deadlines. In some cases, the recreation director did assist the families on meeting these deadlines. Follow up calls were made in April to those parents who did not reply to the letter and one meeting was held in early May for any parents needing further assistance. (Only two parents attended this meeting).

Staffing Plans. Because most of the camps felt comfortable having children with disabilities attending their camps with minimal support, it was decided to concentrate support at the YMCA

©Project REC, Training and Research Institute for People with Disabilities: this article may be copied for private use but not for profit or publication.

camp, where most of the campers with disabilities would be going. Furthermore, as was discovered in the first year, most of the camps found that they did not need much more than an initial meeting to discuss the child's needs. Therefore, the staffing patterns were changed during the second year.

An assistant director, who had previously been a counselor at Camp Discovery, was hired. She would be at the YMCA camp every day, carry a beeper at all times, and be available to cover for any counselors who were absent or in case of an emergency. This freed the recreation director to work closer with the director of each camp, trouble shooting when necessary. It futher enabled her to continue with other programs separate from her camp responsibilities. In addition, four counselors were hired. One of these stayed only for half the summer, and it was not necessary to replace him.

In order to facilitate integration, a behavioral consultant and the consultant from Children's Hospital were again available. A separate nurse was no longer needed since the children applied directly to the camps. In addition, although the recreation director was not at camp every day, she was available if the need arose. The behavioral consultant worked with certain counselors upon request regardless of whether the camper in question was disabled. She worked an average of 8 hours per week, and as it turned out, worked much more with the children who where not diagnosed as disabled. The recreation consultant was used primarily during the first week to meet with counselors, directors, and parents. For the remainder of the summer, she was only utilized for brief trouble shooting telephone conversations. Finally, a volunteer was available one to three days a week. She was able to provide some extra training for the youth in the CIT (Counselor in Training) programs.

Training counselors. The training program for the counselors hired by GWARC was the same as that of the YMCA counselors since that is where they would be spending most of their time. The director of the YMCA camp and the GWARC recreation director planned the training session jointly. Although there was a specific time scheduled for disability issues to be introduced and questions and concerns addressed, "disability awareness" was incorporated into all of the activities. For example, each specialist gave a talk about his or her area of specialty such as sports or arts and crafts, and at that time the group would discuss how all children could be included in the activity and

©Project REC, Training and Research Institute for People with Disabilities: this article may be copied for private use but not for profit or publication.

what counselors could do to facilitate full participation. Finally, all counselors were made aware of who had had experience with children with disabilities in the past and were assured that it was ok, even expected, for them to ask questions of these counselors at any time. Training included an overview of the camp (rules, regulations, paper work, etc.), first aid, positive behavior management techniques, role modeling and communication, and skill enhancement. It occurred during one four hour evening session and one full day session. In addition, staff members went on an overnight camping trip to further enhance their camping skills and build a cohesive team. Despite the fact that counselors were hired in two different manners and for different reasons, they were all incorporated into one staff. Everyone received training on how to work with children with and without disabilities, and it was constantly emphasized that everyone was there to serve all the children. In this way, each counselor was encouraged to be responsible for each child and the YMCA felt full ownership of the program. Figure 3 indicates the camper and staffing ratios in each of the camps over the entire summer.

Transportation. This year parents were encouraged to utilize the transportation of the camp their child attended or to provide their own transportation. Since there was always a parent or a counselor at one end of the bus ride, it was not necessary for GWARC staff to ride on the camp vans or buses with the campers. GWARC was able to help arrange carpools in a few instances. However, there were two children who would not be able to attend camp without door to door transportation. In order to ensure that all children would be included, GWARC arranged transportation with a private cab company for these children. Because of the expense of such private transportation companies, GWARC plans to only utilize carpools in the future as there are many parents willing to pick up their children.

Budget comparisons

Integrating summer camps does not have to be an expensive proposition for the organization who previously provided a segregated camp for youth with disabilities. As indicated in Table 4, the monies spent during the three years when GWARC went from a totally separate camp (1989) to partial integration (1990) to full integration (1991) are very similar. In fact the 1991 budget was slightly lower than that of 1990.

©Project REC, Training and Research Institute for People with Disabilities: this article may be copied for private use but not for profit or publication.

Table 3
Camper to Counselor Ratios

Camp & Ratio / Week	YMCA Camp Cabot	YMCA Pooh's Camp	City Camp Prospect	City Kinder Camp	Girl Scout Camp Cedar Hill	CIT's/ Volunteers/ Counselors
1	4:1.75 / 107:11.75	1:1 / 13:3	0:0 / 38:6	0:0 / 15:3	1:0.25 / 350:35.25	6:1 / 20:2
2	4:2 / 111:14	1:1 / 39:5	0:0 / 75:10	0:0 / 15:3	1:0 / 350:35	7:1 / 20:2
3	9:1.5 / 125:14.5	1:1 / 41:6	1:0.25 / 75:10.25	2:0.25 / 15:3.25	0:0 / 350:35	6:1 / 20:2
4	8:1.5 / 122:14.5	1:1 / 48:6	1:0.25 / 75:10.25	2:0.25 / 15:3.25	0:0 / 350:35	6:1 / 20:2
5	6:2 / 128:15	2:1 / 37:5	0:0 / 75:10	0:0 / 15:3	0:0 / 350:35	3:1 / 20:2
6	4:2 / 130:185	4:1 / 36:5	0:0 / 75:10	1:0.5 / 15:3	0:0 / 350:35	3:0.5 / 20:1.5
7	5:2 / 115:14	4:1 / 37:5	0:0 / 75:10	0:0 / 15:3	1:0.75 / 350:35.75	3:0.25 / 10:1.25
8	8:2.5 / 113:14.5	1:1 / 37:5	camp not in session	camp not in session	1:0.25 / 350:35.25	3:0.25 / 20:1.25

KEY

campers with disabilities : counselors hired by GWARC / **total** campers : **total** counselors

*Please note that that the **total** figures include both campers with diabilities and counselors hired by GWARC. Decimal figures reflect counselors who split their time between groups and camps. Numbers of campers with disabilities do not necessarily reflect total numbers; at least 40 additional youth with disabilities attended the camps without direct support.

©Project REC, Training and Research Institute for People with Disabilities: this article may be copied for private use but not for profit or publication

Table 4

GWARC Camp Budget Comparisons for 1991, 1990 and 1989

FUNDING	1991	1990	1989
City of Waltham	$20,000	$30,000	$25,000
Camper Fees	0	$3,750	$3,000
Donations	$12,000	$1,500	$2,850
TOTAL FUNDING	$32,000	$35,250	$30,850
EXPENSES			
Salaries and Related Expenses			
Camp Director	$3,810	$3,500	$3,600
Counselors (1991-5, 1990-7, 1989-6)	$12,715	$12,700	$10,515
Counselors In-Training (1991-2)	$1,260	0	0
Medical Staff	0	$3,550	$2,945
Consultant - Behaviorist	$1,460	$2,195	0
FICA	$1,545	$1,510	$1,060
Workmens Compensations	$220	$180	$110
Unemployment Insurance	$625	$540	$310
Total Salaries and Related	$21,635	$24,175	$18540
Transportation	$3,000	$3,000	$4,200
Supplies and Materials	$250	$1,050	$1,450
Activity and Event Fees	0	$850	$1,000
Insurance	$250	$250	$310
Administrative Expenses (GWARC Management, Secretarial, Public Relations, Employment Ads, Office Supplies, Postage and Rental Fees, Scholarships)	$6,865	$5,925	$5,350
TOTAL EXPENSES	$32,000	$35,250	$30,850

Of course, some individual budget lines are quite different due to the different staffing patterns or fee arrangements that integration can bring. For example, there was no behavioral consultant in 1989 for Camp Discovery but during that year and 1990, GWARC had to provide nursing staff directly because of licensure requirements. In 1991 there was no need for activity fees and less need for supplies and materials since campers registered directly to other city camps. This

©Project REC, Training and Research Institute for People with Disabilities: this article may be copied for private use but not for profit or publication.

process also eliminated payment of camper fees directly to GWARC. Expenses related to hiring counselors were very similar across the years. The difference in staffing came in training and roles not in the numbers hired. It is important to remember that although GWARC continued to hire counselors who had experience in the disability area, they were trained with other counselors in 1991 to be a regular member of the city camp staffs and to work with all campers. All camps agreed that it was easier for GWARC to hire some specialized staff and provide funding toward some of the transportation sources and camper scholarships rather than the city camps assuming total responsibility for these areas. Finally, administrative costs remained similar. There was a need for advertising, meetings with various groups (administrative time), and office expenses regardless of whether campers were in segregated or integrated camps.

Results and Recommendations

The process for changing the summer camp experience in one city took less than two years, from January, 1990 through August, 1991. Because of planning and commitment, costs did not increase and the basic roles of any paid staff from any organization did not change. Everyone involved in integrating the city camps has been pleased with the outcomes. Regular camp personnel and administration learned that inclusion does not have to change staffing, programming, or financing. Those who had previously worked in separate camps learned that integration can be achieved where there is complete commitment, plenty of time for planning and communicating, and a sound budget whose bottom line remains unchanged.

Campers and their families experienced the greatest benefits. Now "camper buddies" have become school friends and parents of campers with disabilities want to access other school and community programs. Facilities such as the YMCA have begun to invite people with disabilities to join in regular classes and activities rather than always initiating a separate program.

Our experience with integrating summer camps over the two summers provided some consistent feedback on practices that work and pitfalls to avoid. Many of these "lessons" are listed in Table 5.

©Project REC, Training and Research Institute for People with Disabilities: this article may be copied for private use but not for profit or publication.

Table 5

Tips for Enhancing Integration

1. Train all staff together on all topics.
2. If using the "camp within a camp" approach, make sure that schedules are the same and that there are not separate areas for some activities. If you can avoid this intermediate step, try to eliminate it. However, it does provide an alternative for families who insist on special programs.
3. Provide direct training to older campers on how they can include campers with disabilities in various activities. Talk directly about what disabilities are and allow them opportunities to ask questions.
4. Provide immediate and consistent feedback to parents so that they don't worry. Photographs of kids having fun are great "success proofs."
5. Assign someone such as the recreation director or a very experienced, mature counselor to float between campers and be available in crisis situations. A beeper is a wonderful tool!
6. Be prepared for much less structure in regular summer camps. The campers will have no problems with this but parents and counselors need to understand that this is a normal situation.
7. Don't force kids with disabilities to socialize with kids or participate in every activity. They need a little time to adjust to the new situation. In many instances, if kids with and without disabilities are in the same area, doing the same things, they will initiate the integration. Reinforce this.
8. Camp directors (if there are separate ones) should share supervision of all staff and jointly plan all activities and training.
9. The roles of counselors should be meshed as much as possible so that all counselors are responsible for assisting all children. In other words, move away from the concepts of "special" counselors for "special" campers.

©Project REC, Training and Research Institute for People with Disabilities: this article may be copied for private use but not for profit or publication.

Table 5 (continued)

10.	Give campers with disabilities the space and freedom to be kids like everyone else. Fade into the background as much as possible and give others the chance to interact. Don't hover unnecessarily! When you can totally fade from a site because regular counselors are providing enough assistance, do it. Just make sure that parents are aware of your plan.
11.	Give parents of campers with disabilities plenty of time to adjust to the idea of integration, especially if their son or daughter previously attended a separate camp. Have them visit camps and meet directors and become familiar with daily schedules. Make sure they understand that there is plenty of support and expertise around at all times.

Other simple things that parents can do and that staff can prepare parents to do are included in Table 6. These small reminders can really make an impact on an inexperienced or very young camper.

Table 6

Daily Guide for Sending Children to Camp	
1.	Camp is a fun place but a messy place. Don't send your child in brand new or fancy clothing.
2.	Camp is very physical. If most of the children wear shorts and t-shirts to camp, your child should too.
3.	Don't forget to include your child's name (first and last) on every piece of clothing (shoes and socks included). Make sure to mark clothing discreetly so your child will suffer no embarrassment. Keep in mind that as a rule children at camp lose things. No matter how well you mark their clothing, something will get lost.
4.	Good sneakers are a must! Children spend a lot of time running from activity to activity as well as running during the activity. When they're not running, they're walking or being pushed in their wheelchairs.
5.	Water fights, mud, and drink spills all make for messy clothing—an extra set is a real added plus. Inquire at the camp office because often they have a special area to leave extra clothing so your child will not have to carry it all day.

©Project REC, Training and Research Institute for People with Disabilities: this article may be copied for private use but not for profit or publication.

Table 6 (continued)

6.	Children are expected to change back and forth from swimsuit to clothes several times a day. Buttons, hooks, and ties make this slow going for many children. Shorts with elastic waists are easier than zippers and snaps. Pullover shirts with a design on one side make it easy to see which way the shirt goes on. Shoes with velcro are much easier than pull-ons (which are difficult to get on wet feet) and tie-ups. Lots of kids who are not disabled wear velcro sneakers to camp for this reason.
7.	Let counselors know your child's abilities and likes, not only what s/he dislikes or can't do. They will realize that soon enough! This could be a growing experience for both of you.
8.	Even though it may be frightening, give your child permission to participate in special events and field trips. This way your child may remain a part of the group s/he is in. The counselors will ask if they have questions or need help. If you are too nervous to allow your child to participate independently for the first time, ask if you can come along. Volunteers are usually welcome.
9.	A strap can be used to secure glasses even if it is not normally used. Perspiration from the amount of activity at camp easily causes glasses to slip.
10.	Do not send more than is necessary with your child. An overstuffed backpack can become quite a burden when carried all over camp. A backpack is better that a carrier with just shoulder straps or handles.
11.	Put sunscreen on your child in the morning instead of sending the entire bottle for your child to carry all day. If your child is extremely sensitive to the sun and will need applications throughout the day, check with the counselor and allow him/her to be responsible for the bottle. A strong screen of 15+ or more is a must.
12.	An extra juice box is wonderful for snack time.
13.	Extra food that will not smash easily can be put in small bags for snack time. Do not put the bags in with the lunch—children tend to eat whatever is in front of them at snack time, and lunch needs to be saved until lunchtime.

©Project REC, Training and Research Institute for People with Disabilities: this article may be copied for private use but not for profit or publication.

In summary, giving children and teenagers with disabilities the chance to have fun with other kids from their local neighborhoods through an integrated summer camp experience can be rewarding for everyone. It takes planning, communication, commitment, and a willingness to take risks. However, with the right leadership, existing camp budgets, and staff, it can be done in a relatively short period of time.

©Project REC, Training and Research Institute for People with Disabilities: this article may be copied for private use but not for profit or publication.

References

Brinker, R. P. (1985). Interactions between severely mentally retarded students and other students in integrated and segregated public school settings. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 89, 587-594 .

Brown, L., Branston-McLean, M., Baumgart, D., Vincent, B., Falvey, M. & Schroeder, J. (1979). Using the characteristics of current and subsequent least restrictive environments in the development of curricular content for the severely handicapped students. AAESPH Review, 4 (4), 407-424 .

Datillo, J. (1991). Recreation and leisure: A review of the literature and recommendations for future directions. In L. Meyer, C. Peck, & L. Brown (Eds.) Critical issues in the lives of People with severe disabilities (pp. 171-193) . Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Donder, D. & Nietupski, J. (1981). Nonhandicapped adolescents teaching playground skills to their mentally handicapped peers: Toward a less restrictive middle school environment. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 16, 270-276.

Edwards, D., 7 Smith R. (1989) . Social interaction in any integrated day camp setting. Therapeutic Recreation, 23 (3), 7 1-78 .

Halle, J. W., Halle, D. G. & Bemben, D. A. (1989). Effects of a peer-medicated aerobic conditioning program on fitness measures with children who have moderate and severe disabilities. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 14(1), 33-47.

Isaacs, L. I. & Clark, J. A. (1988). Life lines: People with disabilities speak out. Boston: Massachusetts DD Council.

McHale, S. M., & Simeonsson, R. J. (1980). Effects on interaction on nonhandicapped children's attitudes toward autistic children. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 85, 18-24.

Mitchell, A., Robberson, J., & Obley, J. (1977). Camp counseling. Philadelphia: Saunders.

©Project REC, Training and Research Institute for People with Disabilities: this article may be copied for private use but not for profit or publication.

Moon, S. & Bunker L. (1987). Recreation and motor skills programming. In M. Snell (Ed.), Systematic instruction of persons with severe handicaps. (pp. 214-244). Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing.

Nietupski, J. A., Hamre-Nietupski, S. & Ayers, B. (1984). Review of task analytic leisure skill training efforts: Practitioner implications and future research needs. The Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 9, 88-97.

Rynders, J., Schleien, S., & Mustonen, T. (1990). Integrating children with severe disabilities for intensified outdoor education: Focus on feasibility. Mental Retardation, 28(1), 7-14.

Schleien, S. J. & Ray, M. T. (1988). Community recreation and persons with disabilities. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing.

Stainback, S. & Stainback W. (1985). Integration of students with severe handicaps into regular schools. Reston: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Voeltz, L. M. (1982). Effects of structured interactions with severely handicapped peers on children's attitudes. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 86, 380-390.

York, J., Vandercook, T. & Stave, K. (1990). Recreation and leisure activities: Determining the favorites for middle school students. Teaching Exceptional Children, 22(4), 10-13.

©Project REC, Training and Research Institute for People with Disabilities: this article may be copied for private use but not for profit or publication.